UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/684,056	10/10/2003	Brett A. Rearick	IR-2933(NBA)CIP	5248

193 7590 03/01/2007
LORD CORPORATION
PATENT & LEGAL SERVICES
111 LORD DRIVE
CARY, NC 27512

EXAMINER	
BAREFORD, KATHERINE A	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1762	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/01/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

C

Office Action Summary	**Application No.** 10/684,056	**Applicant(s)** REARICK ET AL.	
	Examiner Katherine A. Bareford	**Art Unit** 1762	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 February 2007.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-12 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 13-26 and 28-34 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Claim 27 is canceled.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment of February 5, 2007 (in response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment of January 5, 2007) has been received and entered. With the amendment, claims 1-12 remain withdrawn, claim 27 is canceled, and claims 13-26 and 28-34 are pending for examination.

Election/Restrictions

2. Applicant's election of Group II, claims 13-34, in the reply filed on February 5, 200~~6~~7 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

In the amendment, applicant's only mention of the restriction was to indicate that claims 1-12 stand withdrawn from consideration. The Examiner understands this to be a confirmation of the telephone election of June 7, 2006, where claims 1-12 were withdrawn from consideration as drawn to the non-elected invention.

3. Claims 1-12 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on February 5, 2007.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 13-26 and 28-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 13, lines 2 and 4: applicant now uses the term "step transfer apparatus" (the Examiner notes that the specification primarily uses the term "square transfer apparatus"), however, there is no indication as to how "step" or "square" limits the use of a "transfer apparatus" or whether they are the same thing. As worded it appears that any apparatus that performs transfer of the substrate through process stations would read on the claims, and for the purpose of examination, the Examiner has taken that position. In the amendment of February 5, 2007, applicant provided no indication as to the requirements of a "step transfer apparatus" as claimed and how it differs or is the same from the Examiner's position. Therefore, the rejection as to indefiniteness remains.

Claim 26, line 3, applicant now uses a "step transfer apparatus", (the Examiner notes that the specification primarily uses the term "square transfer apparatus") however, there is no indication as to how "step" or "square" limits the use of a "transfer apparatus". As worded it appears that any apparatus that performs transfer of the substrate through process stations would read on the claims, and for the purpose of examination, the Examiner has taken that position. In the amendment of February 5, 2007, applicant provided no indication as to the requirements of a "step transfer apparatus" as claimed and how it differs or is the same from the Examiner's position. Therefore, the rejection as to indefiniteness remains.

The other dependent claims do not cure the defects of the claims from which they depend.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The rejection of claims 13-14, 18, 22 and 26-27 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ahmed et al (US 5114751) is withdrawn due to applicant's amendments of February 5, 2007, providing a specific coating composition to be used in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 13-14, 18, 22 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahmed et al (US 5114751) in view of Kucera (US 6130289).

Claim 13: Ahmed teaches a method for coating a metal substrate utilizing a transfer apparatus. Column 3, lines 5-10 and column11, lines 50-60. The metal substrate is transferred along a travel path utilizing a travel system of the transfer apparatus from a prior station to an autodeposition coating station. Figures 1A and 1B, column 11, line 50 through column 12, line 45 (the transfer apparatus would be the series of conveyor belts, 6′, 8′, 10′, 12′, 14′, 16′, etc., which form the travel system). The substrate is dipped in an autodepositable coating composition located in a tank at the autodeposition coating station. Figure 1B and column 12, lines 15-30 (container 18). The coated substrate is withdrawn from the autodepositable composition after a predetermined period of time. Figure 1B and column 12, lines 20-30 (the fall onto the conveyor belt and the movement upwards by the conveyor belt would take a set amount of time), column 8, lines 65-68 and column 13, lines 30-35 (showing the controlled immersing time). Ahmed does not teach that the coating apparatus a "step" or "square" transfer apparatus, however, as discussed in the 35 USC 112 rejection above, it is unclear how this would limit the apparatus, and therefore, the Examiner has taken the position that it does not limit the apparatus.

Claim 14: the substrate is treated with a pretreatment solution at a pretreatment station located on the travel path before the autodeposition coating station. Figure 1A and column 11, lines 50-68, for example.

Claim 18: the substrate is transferred to a dehydration station after the autodepositable coating has been applied to the substrate. The coated substrate is dehydrated at the dehydration station. Figure 1B and column 12, lines 35-45 (the oven would dehydrate as well) and column 13, lines 35-45.

Claim 22: the coating composition is a metal treatment composition. Column 13, lines 1-45 (as the coating composition treats the metal substrate by coating it, at the least).

Claim 26: Ahmed teaches an autodeposition coating process for forming a coating on an electrochemically active metal substrate. Column 3, lines 5-10 and column 4, lines 40-65. A transfer apparatus is provided having travel system capable of conveying the metal substrate between two or more stations. Figures 1A and 1B, column 11, line 50 through column 12, line 45 (the transfer apparatus would be the series of conveyor belts, 6', 8', 10', 12', 14', 16', etc., which form the travel system). A metal pretreatment step is performed on the metal substrate at one station. Figure 1A and column 11, lines 50-68, for example. An autodepositable coating is applied on the metal substrate at a subsequent station. Figure 1B and column 12, lines 15-30 (container 18). Ahmed does not teach that the coating apparatus a "step" or "square" transfer apparatus, however, as discussed in the 35 USC 112 rejection above, it is unclear how this would limit the apparatus, and therefore, the Examiner has taken the position that it does not limit the apparatus.

Ahmed teaches all the features of these claims except the composition of the autodepositable coating. Ahmed does teach that a variety of compositions can be used (see for example column 5, lines 40-55). It is also noted that Ahmed is assigned to the Henkel Corporation (see assignee information on the front page of the patent).

However, Kucera teaches an aqueous phenolic resin dispersion that can be desirably used in autodeposition coating. Column 2, lines 60-65 and column 11, lines 45-60. As to the use of autodeposition, Kucera describes it as being "explained in a multitude of patents assigned to Parker Amchem and/or Henkel". See column 11, lines 50-60. Kucera teaches that the aqueous dispersion can a phenolic novolak resin. Column 5, lines 35-45 and column 7, lines 60-65. The dispersed novolak can be produced by reacting a phenolic resin precursor with modifying agent and multi-hydroxy phenolic compounds. Column 7, lines 60-68. The reaction is typically acid catalyzed with an acid such as phosphoric acid. Column 8, lines 1-10. The modifying agent can have at least one functional moiety that enables the modifying agent to react with the phenolic resin precursor and at least one ionic moiety. Column 9, lines 25-33. Kucera teaches that the phenolic resin dispersion forms desirable environmentally resistant, non-resolvatable films. See column 10, lines 49-68.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ahmed to use an autodepositable composition comprising an aqueous dispersion of a phenolic novolak resin with the described reaction product of the present claims as suggested by Kucera in order to provide a desirable environmentally resistant, non-resolvatable coating, because Ahmed teaches a method of providing a desirable autodepositable coating on articles, where various different compositions can be used, and Kucera teaches a coating composition that comprises an aqueous dispersion of a phenolic novolak resin with the described reaction product of the present claims that can be used in autodeposition process (specifically referring to Henkel patents - which would include Ahmed-- as providing the principles and advantages of autodeposition coatings) and that such phenolic resin compositions provide desirable environmentally resistant, non-resolvatable coating.

10. Claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahmed in view of Kucera as applied to claims 13-14, 18, 22 and 26 above, and further in view of Newton et al (US 5211992).

Ahmed in view of Kucera teaches all the features of these claims except the withdrawal rate. Ahmed also teaches that the transfer system can use a carrier container with immersion using a mechanical arm carrier on a conveyor belt. Column 8, line 45 through column 9, line 5. Ahmed also teaches the known coating method for autodeposition coatings includes hanging the articles to be coated from a mount on a conveyor line which carries the articles through various pre-treating stages to a bath of autodeposition composition and then to post treating stages, where the conveyor line is designed to dip the article in the bath of coating composition. Column 1, line 50 through column 2, line 10.

However, Newton teaches a process where articles to be coated are picked up by a conveyor system and carried to a resin bath to immerse the articles in the bath and then remove the articles and pass the articles to further stations for further processing. See figures 1 and 15 and column 5, lines 10-20. Newton teaches that the period of dipping can vary according to the article and the composition of the coating material and coating desired. Column 9, lines 20-35. Newton further teaches that controlled withdrawal speed is important to providing an even coating, with fast speeds dragging more material out of the bath with the article and slow speeds dragging less material and allowing more run off of excess material to occur. Column 9, lines 35-50. Newton teaches to provide a dual speed withdrawal by first having the bottles undergo a relatively fast withdrawal and then use a second, slower withdrawal stage during which the article is finally withdrawn in order to minimize drips or runs at the base. Column 9, lines 45-60.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ahmed in view of Kucera to optimize the withdrawal rate of the coated substrate when using a container on a conveyor or an article hung from a container and use a dual withdrawal rate as suggested by Newton in order to provide a desirable even coating as Ahmed in view of Kucera teaches to provide immersion of the article for a controlled amount of time to provide a desirable coating and then to withdraw the article and Newton teaches that when immersing and article and withdrawing it to provide a coating it is desirable to optimize the amount of time of immersion and to optimize the withdrawal speed and to use a dual withdrawal speed with a first period of relatively fast withdrawal speed and a second period of relatively slow withdrawal speed. The optimization would provide a rate less than the drainage rate and provide the claimed first and second withdrawal speeds.

11. Claims 17 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahmed in view of Kucera as applied to claims 13-14, 18, 22 and 26 above, and further in view of Smith (US4199624).

Ahmed in view of Kucera teaches all the features of these claims except the pretreatment of an alkaline and an acid pickle treatment. Ahmed does teach to rinse the substrate at a rinsing station after cleaning. Column 12, lines 5-15. Ahmed also teaches that the cleaning solution can be an alkaline cleaning composition. Column 13, lines 1-15.

However, Smith teaches that when performing an autodeposition coating process, it is well known to first provide an alkaline cleaning treatment and then provide an acid pickle treatment for coating. Column 2, lines 35-55 and column 11, lines 20-40. The article is first cleaned with alkaline cleaning solution, then rinsed with water, then acid treated, then rinsed with water and then coated with an autodeposition solution. Column 11, lines 20-40. This process helps provide a more even coating. column 2, lines 35-45.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ahmed in view of Kucera to provide pretreatment steps of alkaline cleaning, rinsing, acid pickling, and rinsing before autodeposition coating as suggested by Smith in order to provide a desirable even coating as Ahmed in view of Kucera teaches to provide an autodeposition coating process with pre and post treatment of the article and Smith teaches that when performing autodeposition coating it is desirable to provide a pretreatment of cleaning, rinsing, acid pickling, and rinsing before autodeposition coating in order to provide a more even coating.

12. Claims 19-21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahmed in view of Kucera as applied to claims 13-14, 18, 22 and 26 above, and further in view of Benton et al (US 4657788).

Ahmed in view of Kucera teaches all the features of these claims except repeating the coating process in a second tank and providing post dehydration after each coating and then a final cure station, and the specific materials of the first and second coating.

However, Benton teaches that when performing an autodeposition coating process, it is well known to provide multiple stage deposition of autodeposition coatings on metal substrates. Column 1, lines 5-15. The coating process includes coating by immersion, withdrawal and water rinsing, followed by a first drying period. Column 5, lines 30-60. Then the substrate is reimmersed in the coating bath, rinsed and dried again. Column 5, lines 50-60. After all the immersion, rinsing and drying steps, the coated substrate can be baked to cure. Column 5, lines 60-65.

It is the Examiner's position that when applying multiple coatings by autodeposition it is well known to provide multiple layers of adhesives. As applicant has not traversed this position from the Office Action of June 19, 2006, it is understood to be agreed to by applicant.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ahmed in view of Kucera to repeat the coating process in a second tank and providing post dehydration after each coating and then a final cure station as suggested by Benton in order to provide a desirable even coating as Ahmed in view of Kucera teaches to provide an autodeposition coating process where the coating and treatment steps occur at a series of stations and Benton teaches that when performing autodeposition coating it is desirable to multiple coating, rinsing and drying steps before final curing. This process would be provided with second stations for coating, rinsing and drying, because Ahmed in view of Kucera teaches that the process occurs in series with new tanks for each step (as shown by the multiple rinsing tanks of Ahmed). If further would have been obvious to perform the process with different coating materials as desired, such as different adhesives, because it is the Examiner's position that it is well known to apply multiple layers of adhesives by autodeposition coating processes.

13. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahmed in view of Kucera and Benton as applied to claims 19-21 and 23 above, and further in view of Todd (US 2654462).

Ahmed in view of Kucera and Benton teaches all the features of these claims except that the travel system comprises a reciprocal carriage. Ahmed also teaches that the transfer system can use a carrier container with immersion using a mechanical arm carrier on a conveyor belt. Column 8, line 45 through column 9, line 5. Ahmed also teaches the known coating method for autodeposition coatings includes hanging the articles to be coated from a mount on a conveyor line which carries the articles through various pre-treating stages to a bath of autodeposition composition and then to post treating stages, where the conveyor line is designed to dip the article in the bath of coating composition. Column 1, line 50 through column 2, line 10.

However, Todd teaches that when carrying items to be immersed in process station baths, including coating baths, a well known conveying type of system for holding articles is a reciprocal carriage type system. Column 4, line 55 through column 5, line 60.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ahmed in view of Kucera and Benton to provide a desirable conveyor system as suggested by Todd in order to provide a desirable method of conveying the article as Ahmed in view of Kucera and Benton teaches to provide sequence of autodeposition steps and that various conveyor systems can be used and Todd teaches that when carrying items to be immersed in process station baths, including coating baths, a well known conveying type of system for holding articles is a reciprocal carriage type system

14. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahmed in view of Kucera as applied to claims 13-14, 18, 22 and 26 above, and further in view of Todd (US 2654462).

Ahmed in view of Kucera teaches all the features of these claims except that the travel system comprises a reciprocal carriage. Ahmed also teaches that the transfer system can use a carrier container with immersion using a mechanical arm carrier on a conveyor belt. Column 8, line 45 through column 9, line 5. Ahmed also teaches the known coating method for autodeposition coatings includes hanging the articles to be coated from a mount on a conveyor line which carries the articles through various pre-treating stages to a bath of autodeposition composition and then to post treating stages, where the conveyor line is designed to dip the article in the bath of coating composition. Column 1, line 50 through column 2, line 10.

However, Todd teaches that when carrying items to be immersed in process station baths, including coating baths, a well known conveying type of system for holding articles is a reciprocal carriage type system. Column 4, line 55 through column 5, line 60.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ahmed in view of Kucera to provide a desirable conveyor system as suggested by Todd in order to provide a desirable method of conveying the article as Ahmed in view of Kucera teaches to provide sequence of autodeposition steps and that various conveyor systems can be used and Todd teaches that when carrying items to be immersed in process station baths, including coating baths, a well known conveying type of system for holding articles is a reciprocal carriage type system

15. Claims 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahmed in view of Kucera and Smith as applied to claims 17 and 28-30 above, and further in view of Benton et al (US 4657788).

Ahmed in view of Kucera and Smith teaches all the features of these claims except repeating the coating process in a second tank and providing post dehydration after each coating.

However, Benton teaches that when performing an autodeposition coating process, it is well known to provide multiple stage deposition of autodeposition coatings on metal substrates. Column 1, lines 5-15. The coating process includes coating by immersion, withdrawal and water rinsing, followed by a first drying period. Column 5, lines 30-60. Then the substrate is reimmersed in the coating bath, rinsed and dried again. Column 5, lines 50-60. After all the immersion, rinsing and drying steps, the coated substrate can be baked to cure. Column 5, lines 60-65.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ahmed in view of Kucera and Smith to repeat the coating process in a second tank and providing post dehydration after each coating and then a final cure station as suggested by Benton in order to provide a desirable even coating as Ahmed in view of Kucera and Smith teaches to provide an autodeposition coating process where the coating and treatment steps occur at a series of stations and Benton teaches that when performing autodeposition coating it is desirable to multiple coating, rinsing and drying steps before final curing. This process would be provided with second stations for coating, rinsing and drying, because Ahmed teaches that the process occurs in series with new tanks for each step (as shown by the multiple rinsing tanks of Ahmed).

16. Claims 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahmed in view of Kucera, Smith and Benton as applied to claims 31-32 above, and further in view of Newton et al (US 5211992).

Ahmed in view of Kucera, Smith and Benton teaches all the features of these claims except the withdrawal rate. Ahmed also teaches that the transfer system can use a carrier container with immersion using a mechanical arm carrier on a conveyor belt. Column 8, line 45 through column 9, line 5. Ahmed also teaches the known coating method for autodeposition coatings includes hanging the articles to be coated from a mount on a conveyor line which carries the articles through various pre-treating stages to a bath of autodeposition composition and then to post treating stages, where the conveyor line is designed to dip the article in the bath of coating composition. Column 1, line 50 through column 2, line 10.

However, Newton teaches a process where articles to be coated are picked up by a conveyor system and carried to a resin bath to immerse the articles in the bath and then remove the articles and pass the articles to further stations for further processing. See figures 1 and 15 and column 5, lines 10-20. Newton teaches that the period of dipping can vary according to the article and the composition of the coating material and coating desired. Column 9, lines 20-35. Newton further teaches that controlled withdrawal speed is important to providing an even coating, with fast speeds dragging more material out of the bath with the article and slow speeds dragging less material and allowing more run off of excess material to occur. Column 9, lines 35-50. Newton teaches to provide a dual speed withdrawal by first having the bottles undergo a relatively fast withdrawal and then use a second, slower withdrawal stage during which the article is finally withdrawn in order to minimize drips or runs at the base. Column 9, lines 45-60.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ahmed in view of Kucera, Smith and Benton to optimize the withdrawal rate of the coated substrate when using a container on a conveyor or an article hung from a container and use a dual withdrawal rate as suggested by Newton in order to provide a desirable even coating as Ahmed in view of Kucera, Smith and Benton teaches to provide immersion of the article for a controlled amount of time to provide a desirable coating and then to withdraw the article and Newton teaches that when immersing and article and withdrawing it to provide a coating it is desirable to optimize the amount of time of immersion and to optimize the withdrawal speed and the use a dual withdrawal speed with a first period of relatively fast withdrawal speed and a second period of relatively slow withdrawal speed. The optimization would provide a rate less than the drainage rate and provide the claimed first and second withdrawal speeds.

Response to Arguments

17. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 13-26 and 28-34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The Examiner has provided the new reference to Kucera as to the use of the newly claimed specific phenolic resin formulation in autodeposition.

Conclusion

18. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Katherine A. Bareford whose telephone number is (571)

272-1413. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F(6:00-3:30) with the First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on (571) 272-1423. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571) 273-8300 for regular communications and for After Final communications.

Other inquiries can be directed to the Tech Center 1700 telephone number at (571) 272-1700.

Furthermore, information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KATHERINE BAREFORD
PRIMARY EXAMINER